

REMARKS

Twenty-One claims were originally filed in this case, and all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 19 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above changes and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner noted the following portions of the claims as indefinite.

With regard to claim 1, at line 7; the recitation “the inputs of source register” should be recited as “the inputs of blend register”. Applicants have amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner.

With regard to claim 7, at line 5; the first recitation of “the output of” should be deleted. Applicants have amended claim 7 as suggested by the Examiner.

With regard to claim 9, at lines 2, 3-4; the recitation “a second set of outputs” should be recited as “a second set of inputs/outputs”. Applicants have amended claim 9 as suggested by the Examiner.

With regard to claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, the Examiner noted that the recitations “sub-samples” and “sub-sample” are not clear. In particular, the Examiner noted that is not clear if they are same as “destination sub-samples” and “destination sub-sample”. Applicants have amended claims 10, 11, 16 and 17 to remove the term “destination” and clarify that the sub-sample and the sub-samples referred to in the claims are the same. Applicants submit that with

A

these amendments to the claims, there is no longer any ambiguity in the terms sub-sample and sub-samples.

Applicants have also amended claim 13 and 19 to provide proper antecedent basis for term "subtracted value" in addition to other clarifying amendments. This clarification was noted by Applicants' counsel during preparation of this amendment.

With the above amendments to the claims, Applicants believe that the application now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Thus, Applicants request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite be withdrawn.

In paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-21 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. With the above amendments, Applicants believe that the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph have been overcome, and that this application is now in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims presently in this case are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt favorable action are therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
ERIC S. YOUNG, et al.

By: 

Greg T. Sueoka, Esq.
Registration No. 33,800
Fenwick & West LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 858-7194 (Phone)
(650) 494-1417 (Fax)

